

March 1, 1967

A 979

a civic club in existence, as the other previous clubs did not survive.

Our Lion charter president was the late Lion T. "Hamp" McGiboney. Our present active charter members are 4 in number and all are past presidents of this club which are as follows:

Lion H. H. Chapman—retired businessman and present chairman of board of Minnie G. Boswell Hospital.

Lion Carey J. Williams—editor of Greensboro Herald Journal of Greensboro, Georgia, and owner for a number of years.

Lion E. Lloyd Lewis—ordinary of Greene County and has been for many years.

Lion Jones T. Bond—retired insurance agent and Lion past president of Greensboro Lions Club, who was later to be cabinet secretary to district governor T. "Hamp" McGiboney, of District No. 18A. Lion "Hamp" spirit in Lionism will be forever implanted in my heart as well as all the many fellow Lions with whom he came in contact during his lifetime.

Our present president is Lion Dave Flagg, and our Lion secretary is Lion Don Bourne, who, along with the other members, are doing a wonderful job this year.

I wish to pay special tribute to our great international secretary, Lion Melvin Jones, whom I had the pleasure to know personally and to visit his home club in Chicago in his life time and talk with him, which was most inspiring.

In July 1946, Janet Bond, age 15 at the time, and Mr. and Mrs. Fletcher Wallace, of Winder, Georgia, and myself, and other delegates from Georgia, attended the Lions International Convention in San Francisco. On our way up, we came by car and stopped by Los Angeles and were visiting the C.B.S. studio, and while there I was selected from the audience by Walter O'Keefe to go on the air on his program.

In 1946, the Lions Club International number of clubs had grown to 5400 and the number of members, according to the records was 279,116. Since that time, a distance of some 20 years, we now have, according to the records of 1966, some 20,000 clubs and total membership of 800,000 members on this 50th birthday.

Lions Clubs International is one of the few civic clubs which have survived the buffeting and trials of war and depression.

What is Lionism? Prognosticating, is a risky business. Founder Jones whose birthday was January 13th., knew this when he was asked for a prediction he would answer, "I hope there will always be a land of beyond for Lions International! A goal that will keep growing larger and larger as we approach it, yet will keep out of reach, challenging us to run faster, work harder, think bigger and give more."

This is what I think you are doing here at Manatee Lions Club under the fine leadership of Lion President O. B. Van Meter and Lion Secretary LeRoy Post, Lion Past President James M. Wallace, Vice President J. Ralph Brooks, and other fine members and I feel that I bespeak for all of us winter visiting Lions when I say a great big thank you in allowing us to keep our attendance record.

Hostility of Soviet Government To Ban on Antibalistic Missiles System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 18, 1967, the Wash-

ington Post published an article by the Reuters News Agency, datelined Moscow, February 17, which reported that the Soviet Government was hostile to a ban on development and deployment of an antibalistic missile system. In view of the protracted delay by the administration in utilizing funds provided by Congress to move forward with an ABM system, I believe that this article will be of interest.

While I personally have no hope for these negotiations, desirable as an acceptable agreement would be, I would nevertheless have to raise the question as to inspection of Russian territory if such an agreement were ever reached. This is one area in which the Russians have been adamant, and I feel that the likelihood of any real action is nil. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET ABM SHIFT DENIED

Moscow, Feb. 17.—The Soviet government was today reported basically hostile to a ban on anti-ballistic-missile systems as proposed by the United States.

Communist sources said Russia's opposition to a negotiated ABM moratorium was restated privately by officials this week after a Pravda article seemed to suggest that the Soviet view might have changed.

The officials were reliably quoted as saying there was no change in the Kremlin's position, and that basically Russia had no interest at present in negotiating a moratorium with the United States.

Communist sources said the explanation for the Pravda article was that the writer had made a mistake.

Pravda commentator Fyodor Burlatsky had been reprimanded and the newspaper would publish a new article setting out the Kremlin's negative views, the sources said. The sources said Burlatsky's error had caused considerable embarrassment in high government circles.

Today's clarification by Communist officials confirms the Soviet position as well as the negative answer given at his London press conference last week by Prime Minister Kosygin, who had been asked if the Soviet Union thought it possible to agree on a moratorium.

He replied that defensive weapons such as anti-missile missiles were designed to preserve human lives, and "appropriate conclusions" could be drawn from this answer.

The conclusion drawn by most observers was that Kosygin was rejecting President Johnson's call last month for a negotiated moratorium under which both nations would scrap plans for the building of costly anti-missile systems.

On Wednesday, after Kosygin's return from his British visit, Pravda published an article about arms control which quoted him as saying Russia was ready to discuss the curtailment of the arms race both in the field of offensive and defensive weapons.

The Communist Party newspaper's interpretation attracted widespread interest because it went considerably further than Kosygin's original answer.

[United States officials declined to accept the news reports from Moscow yesterday as a definite version of the Soviet position. They acknowledged that it was extremely rare for Communist sources in Moscow to challenge the accuracy of any report in Pravda, but they noted that there was no official authentication of a Pravda error.]

[Officials in Washington said it may be that the Soviet Union is opposed to talking

about anti-missile missile systems alone. But they noted that Secretary of State Dean Rusk said on Feb. 9, after Soviet Premier Kosygin's comments on the subject, that the United States is prepared "to discuss both offensive and defensive weapons with the Soviet Union."

[State Department spokesman reiterated yesterday what Rusk said then, that they would not consider present interpretations of Soviet positions "as their last word on this subject."]

According to Washington reports last month, the Soviet Union has shown interest in discussing an anti-missile ban. But these reports lacked confirmation in Moscow, and were generally regarded here with skepticism.

Communist sources cited three possible reasons for Soviet opposition:

Soviet military doctrine has always been based on a defensive outlook, and anti-missiles fit into such a concept.

Russia is believed to have already started building a limited anti-missile system around Moscow, and work may be too far advanced for it to be halted.

Soviet generals have a deep distrust of President Johnson because of the Vietnam war, and the military climate is against discussions of this nature with the United States at this time.

Great Plains Wheat, Inc.: Increasing Markets for U.S. Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to join with other Members of Congress this morning to hear Mr. Ralph Ball, of Sterling, Kans., president of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., speak on the important efforts being conducted by Western Wheat Associates, Great Plains Wheat, and the National Association of Wheat Growers to increase markets for U.S. wheat.

Mr. Ball, a constituent of mine, presented an enlightening report on these efforts and outlined certain concerns which these organizations have regarding future market development, particularly relating to wheat exports.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of Mr. Ball's remarks made at a congressional breakfast in Washington, D.C., this date, March 1, 1967. The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF RALPH BALL, PRESIDENT, GREAT PLAINS WHEAT, INC., AT CONGRESSIONAL BREAKFAST, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 1, 1967

Also a regional association similar to Western Wheat Associates, Great Plains Wheat is supported by five wheat-producing states in the Plains area—Colorado, Kansas, North Dakota, Oklahoma and South Dakota—and represents about 360,000 producers.

As the surplus continued to grow in the 1950's, wheat producers soon realized they had a larger interest and responsibility in the wheat industry than just producing wheat. Accepting this responsibility, state wheat grower groups, associated with the National Association of Wheat Growers, founded the two organizations to increase markets for U.S. wheat.

These producers contribute their dollars to market development. In addition, Great

March 1, 1967

Plains Wheat contracts with Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture for monies appropriated by Congress under the provisions of P. L. 480, the law you and your colleagues provided as a means of channeling support into a market development program.

The record of these organizations speaks for itself. Exports jumped by more than 500 million bushels since 1955, almost equal to the production of the five Great Plains states in 1964.

Many domestic activities carried on by the GPW member commissions have an effect upon the exports of U.S. wheat also. One such state-commission supported project is the development of a larger kernel Durum Wheat in North Dakota. Member state wheat commissions also carry on extensive programs of education and distribute nutritional information to anyone who asks as well as making crop and market surveys.

Sales are made on price the world over and wheat is no exception. And transportation is an important part of the price. Therefore, transportation is a major activity of GPW. The Great Plains is a vast landlocked area and producers are dependent on the transportation networks to move their wheat to market. This calls for a constant review of rates so that the competitiveness of U.S. wheat is maintained. For instance, the efforts of Great Plains Wheat and the state commissions were instrumental in reducing the export rate from the Plains to the West Coast.

GPW's prime responsibility are the markets of Europe, Africa and South America. We maintain regional offices in The Netherlands and Venezuela and a country office in Brazil. We also cooperate with Western Wheat in Asia.

We are the wheat producers eyes, ears and mouth in the foreign field. In many cases, we are the only voice in the marketplace whose only interest is in U.S. wheat. We fill the gap that neither the government nor the grain trade can, due to the limitations placed upon both. However, we can work only when there is cooperation between all three groups.

The two-way flow of market information is vital to market development. Not only does the Great Plains Wheat staff provide the foreign buyer with information on the U.S. crop, price, availability, credit or the best means of using his purchase, but the staff also receives information concerning the quantity and quality of the local crop and the import needs of the country. This information is then relayed to the stateside staff, U.S.D.A. and grain trade.

One excellent example of GPW's efforts is the purchases by the Swiss Government for its strategic reserve of bread wheat. Normally the Swiss Government buys Canadian Manitoba for this reserve. However, in 1966, after years of effort by GPW staff, the Government purchased 20,000 tons of Dark Northern Spring Wheat. This one purchase clearly illustrated to the Swiss trade that the Government had confidence in the quality of U.S. wheat. After that, U.S. share of bread wheat sales to Switzerland jumped from 14.4 per cent in 1965 to 35.6 per cent for the first 11 months of 1966. The Government also recently announced another 10,000-ton purchase this year.

Even though a country may shift its purchases from a competitor to the United States, Great Plains Wheat's job is not finished. We must continue to inform the buyer of changes in the U.S. market system and aid in solving any difficulties he may encounter. The emphasis shifts from one of promotion to one of service.

The other segments of market development have been competently described by Mr. Moos. Therefore, I will discuss some points hindering our exports.

First is the lack of uniformity in U.S. wheat shipments. Although greatly improved since the change in Grain Standards two years ago, there is still some room for improvement. The change was initiated largely due to an extensive study and cargo-sampling program conducted by GPW and U.S.D.A.

Second, Great Plains Wheat has spent a substantial amount of time convincing the foreign buyer that the United States has a constant supply of quality wheat at competitive prices. The foreign buyer is bound by tradition and buys the same type of wheat year after year. But this position as a major supplier can be quickly put in jeopardy if the quality of our shipments drops or prices remain uncompetitive for any substantial period. Therefore, the United States, with your help, must develop trade and pricing policies that guard our intention of remaining a traditional supplier of quality wheat.

Third, the United States must develop an imaginative credit policy which will encourage sales. Many times our competitor to the north has succeeded in doing business because of its credit policies. The United States should grant credit for longer periods and liberalize the regulations concerning qualifications to accept letters of credit from reputable foreign banks. Even though our interest rates are fair, the strictness of the other rules has blocked many purchases. Another essential to increasing sales is the policy of setting the subsidy well in advance of the marketing year.

Last, trade in wheat and other agriculture products should be afforded the same freedom as trade in industrial products. Therefore, sales of U.S. wheat should be able to move to Eastern Bloc countries through regular shipping channels instead of requiring half of the shipment move in U.S. flag vessels. Increased U.S. trade with East Europe, an accepted part of U.S. foreign policy, should not discriminate against the wheat producer.

Mr. Moos has mentioned other barriers to U.S. wheat sales such as the European Economic Community and the Latin American Free Trade Association, and discussed wheat-producer opinions on such vital negotiations as the Cereals Agreement under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The degree of dependence of U.S. agriculture on the export market this last fiscal year was 17 cents out of every U.S. farmers market dollar. Wheat exports last year represented 70 per cent of U.S. production and exports for the first half of this fiscal year exceed comparable months by 22 per cent.

The cash exports last year provided \$443 million towards alleviating the balance of payments deficit. In addition, monies received from concessional sales helped the drain of gold by paying many U.S. Government expenses overseas. Foreign marketing is of vital interest to both the wheat producer and the United States. Therefore, and I cannot stress it too strongly, the need for market development, in all its phases, will become more important to the future sales of U.S. wheat than it has been in the past.

If the United States is to continue to expand wheat dollar sales, an intensive, cooperative effort between the wheat producer, through his market development association, the Grain Trade and the U.S.D.A. is needed to maintain the United States' position as a traditional supplier of quality wheat at competitive prices. We must also continue working to remove world trade barriers.

Along with the National Association of Wheat Growers and Western Wheat Associates, we thank you for attending our breakfast this morning.

The War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 1, 1967

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday, February 27, 1967, the Augusta Chronicle, Augusta, Ga., published an editorial entitled "Loosening the Bonds." The comments in this editorial support the feelings of the majority of our citizens concerning the conduct of the war in Vietnam, if we are to place any belief in the leading opinion polls conducted recently. This opinion is that "an escalation which can save the lives of Americans and end the war months or years earlier is nothing but common-sense." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LOOSENING THE BONDS

A small but hopefully effective step was taken with announcement Saturday that the federal Administration's no-win policy in Vietnam has been altered to permit artillery shelling of approach routes in North Vietnam used for aggression.

This heavy artillery shelling, already taking place, loosens one of the bonds by which the soft-on-communism bloc has succeeded, like Lilliputian binding a powerful Gulliver, in blocking our strength. It will permit interdiction of columns of vehicles transporting arms, munitions and other supplies to be used directly in bringing death of uncounted numbers of Americans and prolonging the war for months or years.

A similar artillery defense against infiltration will soon be under way by naval vessels along the coast. Both the land-based and naval artillery will be invaluable in supplementing the Air Force attack upon the invader's logistic support. It may be, in fact, that pinpoint shelling can reach and neutralize at least some of the anti-aircraft batteries which have taken toll of our Air Force men.

Every military situation is in some respects unique, and that in Vietnam seems to lend itself especially to utilization of artillery such as is now under way. Development of this concept might well result in a decision to take some of our battleships out of mothballs, in order to intensify shelling of military objectives. The firepower of these vessels, which at one time was thought to be outmoded by the development of airpower and other considerations, could be extremely effective in the present need to restrain military buildup by Hanoi's forces.

We will no doubt hear charges of escalation from those who cannot bear the thought of an American victory. In our opinion, an escalation which can save the lives of Americans and end the war months or years earlier is nothing but common sense.